

**Periodic Review/Program Evaluation  
Follow-up to Prior Pending Approval**

**Recommendations from Review Panel Regarding Programs to Prepare  
Teachers of Health (MA)**

January 28, 2005

<b>Institution:</b> Central Michigan University			<b>Date of Original Review:</b> June 21, 2004		
Program Level	Major (# Credits)	Minor (# Credits)	Group Major (# Credits)	Group Minor (# Credits)	Endorsement Only (# Credits)
Elementary		24 – 25			
Secondary		24 -25			
K-12					
<b>Source of Standards/Guidelines:</b> Michigan State Board of Education				<b>Pub. Date:</b> June 2000	
<b>Program Assessment Summary/Recommendation</b>					
Meets all standards and requirements		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not all standards and requirements are met		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient documentation for program review	
Approval		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval Pending		Approval Suspended	
<b>Standards/Requirements Not Met:</b>					
<i>Standard 5.0 . . . evaluates the effectiveness of school-based health education. Reviewers were not able to understand how teacher candidates will demonstrate and be assessed in this critical standard and its related Competencies 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4.</i>					
<b>Additional information needed/action to be taken:</b>					
<b>Comments:</b>					
Regarding <i>Standard 5.0</i> , while the current narrative provides detailed explanation of how these competencies might be met in courses, the syllabi for 222, 340, and 346 still do not provide evidence that the program helps teacher candidates develop the ability to conduct program evaluation, including assessing student performance, planning and implementing program evaluation, interpreting results, and analyzing findings for future program development.					
Because this standard is such a critical one to the successful implementation of health education, evidence that teacher candidates receive the opportunity to master this standard must be provided. For					

example, while the syllabus for 340 links the competencies to course objectives, it is unclear whether these objectives are linked to teacher candidate demonstration of skills. In the 340 syllabus, Objective 18 states that a student will be able to design health units for K-12 and alternative education students. Where is the assignment explained so that students would know (and, furthermore, that reviewers would read) what the students are doing that demonstrates that they have developed this skill while constructing the health units to meet the objective?

The institution may provide addenda to course syllabi as a response to reviewers' comments and concerns regarding *Standard 5.0*.

Reviewers compliment the institution's response, dated November 30, 2004, to the prior PR/PE recommendation from June 21, 2004. In general, the response clearly addressed concerns raised. For example, *Standard 7.0 . . . acts as a resource person to others regarding healthy development*. is demonstrated as met through the activities described in the standards matrix narrative and in syllabi linked to related *Competencies 7.1* through *7.4*. The review committee is encouraged by CMU's reorganization of the health education teacher preparation program, a revision that will begin to seriously address the health education competencies.

The institution is encouraged to begin collecting outcomes data related to the Health Education standards because outcome data will be the basis of subsequent periodic reviews. By providing the periodic review committee and the teacher candidates with an explanation of assignments and with the rubrics used to assess candidate performance, the institution will be generating the performance-based assessment documents needed to generate outcome data for the next review cycle.